UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Friday, 12 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

ACTION ON ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.25
12 December 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82346 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

ACTION ON ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

1. Mr. CALOUSKI (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.26/Rev.1, explained that operative paragraph 3 of the earlier draft had been reworded in order to make it fully acceptable to all members of the European Community, while operative paragraph 4 had been rearranged so as to make it clear that the draft resolution entailed no financial implications. The revised draft also embodied other minor changes of wording which were self-explanatory. He hoped that the revised draft resolution would meet with the approval of all delegations. His delegation considered it very important from the standpoint of the maintenance of international security that member States spare no effort to keep at least a minimal light of hope alive in the Balkans. That was the sole function of the draft resolution.

2. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) introduced an amendment (A/C.1/48/L.50) to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11 consisting of the insertion in the eighth preambular paragraph between the word "sector" and the words "in order to enhance" of the following: "and should lead to the removal of all restrictions, including those in any international agreements, incompatible with the obligations undertaken under the Convention". The purpose of the amendment was to assure the developing nations that their accession to the treaty would not compromise their legitimate access to materials and technology for peaceful purposes and thus encourage those which had not yet done so to sign the Convention and those which had already signed it to ratify it at the earliest possible date. The language of the amendment followed very closely the language of the Convention itself and was a reminder of the understandings reached under article XII of the Chemical Weapons Convention. The accommodation of the amendment by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution would be a gesture of good will on the part of those who asserted that the Convention did not interfere with the economic development of its Parties.

3. The SECRETARY announced that the following countries had joined the sponsors of the draft resolutions listed: A/C.1/48/L.4: Cape Verde; A/C.1/48/L.5: Australia, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Ukraine and Viet Nam; A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1: Haiti; A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2: Finland and Marshall Islands; A/C.1/48/L.9: Sudan; A/C.1/48/L.11: Haiti; A/C.1./48/L.13/Rev.2: Haiti and Sudan; A/C.1/48/L.15: Panama; A/C.1/48/L.16: Costa Rica, Denmark and Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.17: Haiti; A/C.1/48/L.21: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.23: Panama and Sudan; A/C.1/48/L.28: Cape Verde, Japan and Slovenia; A/C.1/48/L.29: Malaysia; A/C.1/48/L.30: Republic of Korea and Slovenia; A/C.1/48/L.32: Japan; A/C.1/48/L.33: Malta and Slovenia; A/C.1/48/L.34: Afghanistan; A/C.1/48/L.36: Cameroon and Cape Verde; A/C.1/48/L.37: Sudan; A/C.1/48/L.39: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.40: Russian Federation, United States of America and Sudan; A/C.1/48/L.42: Marshall Islands and Slovenia; A/C.1/48/L.43/Rev.1: Slovenia; A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1: Spain and Panama.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.10

4. Mr. BESANCENOT (France), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, which, far from making a positive contribution to the problem of proliferation, ran the risk of confusing the issue. No new study was needed to tell the international community that proliferation was a threat to all and that its prevention was important. Moreover, the real objective of the draft resolution, as the Committee had been given to understand, was to attempt to put the nuclear Powers on trial at the very time when they were demonstrating their commitment to non-proliferation, and to undermine the non-proliferation regime at a time when it was necessary to strengthen it. The draft resolution was therefore inappropriate, and his delegation could not support it.

5. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.10.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine.

6. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.10 was adopted by 94 votes to 5, with 39 abstentions.

7. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation's concern about proliferation and its attachment to the

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

non-proliferation regime were well known. The issue was a serious one, but draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.10 in no way helped to resolve it. His delegation associated itself with the views expressed by the French representative on the draft resolution. Moreover, it was not clear what the proposed report by the Secretary-General would be about or how the study proposed would affect existing efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. Furthermore, there was no single group that corresponded to the "representative intergovernmental group of experts" referred to in the draft resolution; if that group was in fact the Conference on Disarmament his delegation questioned whether that body would have the time to deal with the proposed report or indeed would agree to do so. His delegation had been unable to obtain answers to any of those questions and had therefore voted against the draft resolution.

8. Mr. WESTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.10 should not be interpreted as an indication of a lack of concern on its part for the problem of proliferation. However, it did not believe that the draft resolution would in any way help to deal with the problem. In its view, the "short report" as well as the proposed study of the report would be a complete waste of time and money. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution rather than abstaining because, in his statement on the subject, the representative of Mexico had sought to undermine the whole basis of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which the Mexican Government, like that of the United Kingdom, supported.

9. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had voted against the resolution because of objections to both its content and the context in which it had been submitted. For example, the expression "representative groups of intergovernmental experts" was unclear. On the eve of the 1995 conference on the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it was undesirable to distract Governments from preparations for that important forum. As concerned the context, his delegation did not share the view that the treaty had been built on an archaic definition but, rather, that concepts such as potential, temporary and other types of nuclear States would constitute dangers for non-proliferation and could, instead, harm both the treaty and renewed efforts to reduce nuclear arsenals.

10. Mr. COLLINS (Ireland) said his delegation had abstained in the vote because in the context of the work now under way in preparation for the review of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a further study on that matter would be confusing and unnecessary. In addition, his delegation did not see the usefulness of submitting the Secretary-General's report to a group of intergovernmental experts.

11. Mrs. MASON (Canada) said that her delegation had supported the resolution, which it understood as simply requesting a factual paper drafted by the Secretariat. That would provide useful background to informal discussions in Geneva on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and vehicles for their delivery.

12. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution, and was concerned that some countries opposed practical steps towards progress in the area of non-proliferation. His Government had been one

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

of the first to support the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and had no desire to undermine its effects. The real problem seemed to be that some members of the Preparatory Committee for the 1995 review conference did not want to discuss substantive issues, either in the First Committee or at Geneva.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.16

13. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.16 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33

14. The SECRETARY read out, on behalf of the Secretary-General, a financial statement on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33 noting that the special conference referred to in the draft resolution would be a conference of States parties to the Convention on Biological and Toxin Weapons and that conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties had in the past included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference, including the sessions of the Preparatory Committee, under which no additional cost to the regular budget of the Organization was incurred. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considered that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33 had no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the special conference of the Convention. Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal instruments were to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations could only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question had been received from the States parties in advance.

15. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33 was adopted without a vote.

16. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.39, said that much remained to be done to address the causes of insecurity at the regional level, particularly the threat of the deployment and use of nuclear armaments. The sponsors of the draft resolution felt that a regime similar to those being established in Latin America and in the South Pacific to exclude the nuclearization of those areas could and should be established in South Asia. All countries of the region shared the commitment to keep the area free of nuclear weapons and had made unilateral declarations pledging themselves not to acquire, develop or manufacture them. The time had come to transform those unilateral pledges into a multilateral regime. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.39 followed the lines of General Assembly resolution 47/49, which had been adopted by an overwhelming majority, except for the inclusion of a new operative paragraph welcoming the support of the five nuclear-weapon States for the proposal and calling on them to extend the necessary cooperation in the efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. The sponsors of the draft resolution hoped that the international community would once again give it support and that its adoption would encourage all States in the region to move towards the establishment of such a zone.

Cluster 5

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.39

17. Mr. GAJDA (Hungary), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation's support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia was in line with its policy of supporting all efforts capable of stemming the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nuclear-free zones were helpful to the cause of non-proliferation, with the ultimate goal of making the world totally free of those weapons, and the establishment of such a zone in South Asia would contribute to easing tensions and strengthening peace and security throughout the world.

18. Mr. CHANDRA (India), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft resolution was almost identical to resolution 47/49 of 9 December 1992, and its basic thrust had not changed in more than 18 years. His Government had repeatedly expressed reservations on the ideas it contained, and would, therefore, vote against it. His delegation's position was that nuclear disarmament was a global issue and required a global approach. Although the United Nations had endorsed the principle of nuclear-weapon-free zones in some parts of the world, that endorsement had resulted from a proper definition of the regions and their geographic extent, security needs and concerns. Moreover, the 1993 consensus paper of the Disarmament Commission on regional disarmament associated such zones with freely arrived at decisions among States which took regional characteristics into account. Without such prerequisites, United Nations endorsement of the principle of nuclear-weapon-free zones was inappropriate.

19. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.39.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius.

Abstaining: Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Myanmar, Viet Nam.

20. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.39 was adopted by 125 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

21. Mr. JUSUF (Indonesia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that like other Asian countries, his Government promoted the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia in accordance with the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, under the terms of which that zone should be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region, and States participating in it should comply fully with the objectives and purposes of the agreement or arrangement establishing it. Since efforts aimed at achieving an agreement had not yet reached a successful conclusion, his delegation had abstained in the vote.

22. Mr. CURE (Mauritius) said that though his delegation was in favour of the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones, specific circumstances and considerations had made it unable to support the resolution.

23. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) said that his delegation's support for the resolution did not mean that his Government gave a blanket endorsement to nuclear-weapon-free zones, as might be inferred from the third preambular paragraph of the resolution.

24. Mr. HAN TOE SONG (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his Government's pursuit of a policy designed to rid the Korean peninsula of nuclear weapons demonstrated its belief in the principle underlying the resolution. However, a nuclear-free zone must meet certain conditions: it must be established through agreement among all concerned States in the region, and the characteristics of the region should be taken into account.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.21

25. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.21 was adopted without a vote.

26. Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) said, that despite the fact that his Government was not a signatory of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, it had entered into a commitment at the first Ibero-American summit of Heads of States and Government to the effect that when that Treaty went into force for the other countries of the region, Cuba would become a party as well.

27. Mr. TANAKA (Japan) said that his delegation had joined the consensus adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.21, and had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.39 because it believed denuclearization of the regions would promote peace and stability in the regions concerned and in the world. In support of the efforts to denuclearize the South Asia region, his Government had been holding bilateral consultations with a number of countries.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.